EPA/AMD/R04-98/150
1998

EPA Superfund
Record of Decision Amendment:

CEDARTOWN MUNICIPAL LANDFILL
EPA ID: GAD980495402
OU 01
CEDARTOWN, GA
05/12/1998

EPA 541-R98-150
<IMG SRC 981500>
<IMG SRC 98150A>

AMMENDED RECORD OF DECISION

SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVE SELECTION

CEDARTOWN MUNICIPAL LANDFILL SITE
CEDARTOWN, POLK COUNTY, GEORGIA

PREPARED BY

U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION IV

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

DECLARATION
of the
AMENDED RECORD OF DECISION

SITE NAME AND LOCATION

Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site,
Cedartown, Polk County, Georgia

STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE

This decision document (Amended Record of Decision) presents an amendment to the selected remedial action for the Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site, Polk County, Georgia, developed in accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, 42 U.S.C. Section 9601 et seq., and in accordance with, the National Contingency Plan (NCP) 40 CFR Part 300.

The original selected remedy was signed in November 1993. Based on new information obtained during the Remedial Action, it was determined that the remedy should be amended. This ROD Amendment provides for necessary changes to the remedy based on information obtained during the groundwater monitoring mandated by the November 1993 ROD. This ROD amendment is consistent with the Superfund Administrative Reforms Guidance.

This amended decision is based on the administrative record for the Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site. In addition, this ROD amendment will become a part of the Administrative Record for the site. The Administrative Record for this site can be found at the Information Repository located at the United States Environmental Protection Agency, 61 Forsyth Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 or the Cedartown Public Library, 245 East Avenue, Cedartown, Georgia.

The State of Georgia has concurred on this amendment to the selected remedy (Appendix A).

ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE

Actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances from this site, if not addressed by implementing the response action selected in this ROD amendment, may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health, welfare or the environment.

DESCRIPTION OF SELECTED REMEDY

This document is an amendment to the remedial action described in the Record of Decision (ROD) dated November 2, 1993 for the Site. The function of the remedy, as described in the ROD as amended, is to restrict access to contamination and to reduce contamination to health based levels which are protective of human health and the environment. Contaminated groundwater is the principal threat at the site.

The major components of the amended groundwater remedy are:

- Institutional controls to restrict groundwater use beneath and immediately surrounding the Site, and
- Maintenance of the landfill cover and seep controls.

The requirement for groundwater monitoring and the pump-and-treat contingency have been removed from the remedy.

STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS

The selected remedy, as amended, is protective of human health and the environment, complies with federal and state requirements that are legally applicable or relevant and appropriate, and is cost-effective. This remedy utilizes permanent solutions and alternative treatment technology to the maximum extent practicable, and considered the statutory preference for remedies that employ treatment that reduces toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element.

Because this remedy may result in hazardous substances remaining on-site, a review will be conducted within five years after commencement of the remedy to ensure that the remedy continues to provide adequate protection of human health and the environment. This review will include a groundwater sampling event to verify that the selected remedy remains protective.

<IMG SRC 98150B>

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

AMENDED RECORD OF DECISION

The Decision Summary
Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site

1.0 Site Name, Location, and Description

The Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site (hereinafter the Cedartown Site or the Site) is located in Polk County on the outskirts of the City of Cedartown, Georgia, approximately 60 miles northwest of Atlanta, Georgia. The Site encompasses a former iron ore mine which subsequently was used as a municipal landfill. The Site is situated on the western edge of Cedartown and is bordered on the east by Tenth Street, the south by Route 100 (Prior Station Road), and the north and west by undeveloped and/or agricultural land. Property to the east of the Site consists of an industrial complex. Land to the north, west and south of the Site is a mixture of residential, agricultural, and undeveloped land. Only a portion of the Site lies within the limits of the City of Cedartown. The general location of the Site is illustrated in Figure 1, General Location Map, and Figure 2, Local Map.

The Site, which consists of land formerly used as part of the landfill operations, occupies approximately 94 acres. The Site itself has wooded areas along the north, south and west. A seasonal stream and pond, which appear during periods of high precipitation, exist approximately 700 feet west of the Site perimeter. The eastern half of the Site is covered by thick grasses. Approximately 10 acres of land, situated between the eastern and western halves of the Site, were not used for landfill operations. See Figure 3, Site Map.

The surface of the Site is grassed with limited areas of mainly exposed soil occurring northeast of the location of the former Leary home. The crown of the Site is 872 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) and gently slopes on all sides with the exception of portions of the western perimeter which are relatively steep. During the RI/FS, minor areas of surficial erosion were observed in the central, northwest, and eastern portions of the Site. Evidence of erosion has not been observed during recent inspections by the City of Cedartown. No exposed refuse was observed in any of the erosion areas. One leachate seep was observed on-site. In regular inspections of the seep, no changes have been observed.

Although the Site is not completely fenced, access is limited due to the dense vegetation which occurs around the northern, western, and southern boundaries. The primary access route from the east directs traffic past the City garage and is restricted by a fence gate which limits vehicle access to the Site.

2.0 Site History and Enforcement Activities

The Site was originally developed in the 1880's as an iron ore strip mine. Mining operations continued at the Site, with some interruptions, until the mid 1900's. At that time, portions of the Site were leased and/or subsequently acquired by the City of Cedartown for development as a municipal landfill.

Pits resulting from the strip mining operations were utilized by the City of Cedartown and Polk County as disposal areas for municipal and, to a lesser extent, industrial wastes. These pits contained native clay or may have been partially backfilled with clay previously stockpiled from the mining operations prior to placement of waste materials. Once waste was in pface, the pits were covered and graded.

While the landfill received primarily municipal solid sanitary waste during its operation, quantities of industrial waste were also reportedly disposed at the Site. The industrial wastes disposed at the Site may have included the following:

- sludge from an industrial waste water treatment system,
- animal fat and vegatable oil skimmings from a separation unit,
- liquid dye wastes,
- latex paint and paint sludges, and
- plant trash.

In 1979, in accordance with then applicable State regulations pertaining to the closure of landfills, the Site was covered with a layer of clay soil varying in thickness from one to 12 feet. A vegetative cover was then planted over the soil layer to prevent erosion.

From 1985 to 1987, EPA evaluated conditions at the Site and identified areas of potential investigation. EPA then proposed the Site for inclusion on the National Priorities List (NPL) in June 1988 and finalized the listing in March 1989.

In November 1993, EPA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Site. The ROD selected a remedy consisting of the following:

- cover maintenance and seep controls,
- institutional controls to minimize land use and prevent groundwater use,
- surface water monitoring to ensure leachate contaminants do not migrate from the seep,
- groundwater monitoring to ensure that the contaminants are reduced by natural attenuation and contaminants do not move,
- implementation of a pump and treat sytem if groundwater performance standards have not been met, and
- continued groundwater monitoring after groundwater performance standards were achieved.

<IMG SRC 98150C>
<IMG SRC 98150D>
<IMG SRC 98150E>

3.0 Reasons for Issuing ROD Amendment

This ROD Amendment does not modify the results of the risk assessment or change the cleanup goals/action levels documented in the ROD dated November 1993 and the May 1996 Explanation of Significant Differences Fact Sheet. The purpose of this Amended ROD is to consider new information regarding the most effective groundwater remedy.

The major components of the amended groundwater remedy are:

- Institutional controls to restrict groundwater use beneath and immediately surrounding the Site,
- Maintenance of the landfill cover, and
- Removal of the requirement for groundwater monitoring and the pump-and-treat contingency.

EPA's rationale for modifying the remedy selected in the original ROD is based on new information obtained during the Remedial Action phase. In the original ROD, EPA selected groundwater monitoring to ensure that the contaminants were reduced by natural attenuation and did not migrate away from the site, implementation of a pump and treat system if groundwater performance standards were not met, and continued groundwater monitoring until EPA approves a five-year review concluding that the alternative had achieved continued attainment of the performance standards. Groundwater monitoring for two and one-half years has demonstrated that groundwater contamination levels for all contaminants of concern, except manganese, are below performance standards. Groundwater concentrations of manganese have remained stable in the wells which are contaminated. Manganese contamination has not moved to more distant wells. In addition, EPA analysis of groundwater data demonstrates that manganese contamination in the wells exceeding the groundwater performance standard does not appear to be related to landfill impacts.

4.0 Summary of Site Characteristics and Risks

Site characteristics and risks remain as described in the ROD dated November 1993 and the May 1996 Explanation of Significant Differences Fact Sheet.

5.0 Description of the Alternatives

EPA re-evaluated three alternatives developed as modifications of the Feasibility Study (FS) alternatives.

Alternative 1: Current Remedy with Continued Monitoring

This alternative would include all items selected in the ROD dated November 1993, except the pump and treat contingency. Under this alternative, groundwater monitoring would continue until EPA approves a five-year review concluding that the alternative has achieved continued attainment of the performance standards. Groundwater monitoring is estimated to continue for a minimum of ten years to demonstrate reduction of groundwater contamination. Landfill cover maintenance and seep controls would be a part of this alternative. The estimated cost of this alternative is $320,275.

Alternative 2: Current Remedy with Pump and Treat Contingency

This alternative would include all items selected in the original ROD, including the pump and treat contingency. A pump and treat remedy would involve installation of wells to remove contaminated groundwater from below the Site. The contaminated groundwater would be treated to remove manganese and the treated groundwater would be discharged to a nearby stream. Landfill cover maintenance and seep controls would be a part of this alternative. The estimated cost of this alternative is $8,631,000.

Alternative 3: Institutional and Engineering Controls

This new alternative would include implementation of institutional controls to prevent groundwater use in the areas where performance standards are exceeded. Groundwater monitoring would not be continued since existing data has demonstrated that contamination is not moving away from the Site. Landfill cover maintenance and seep controls would be a part of this alternative. EPA would conduct a five-year review to determine if the remedy remained protective of human health and the environment. The estimated cost of this alternative is $5,000.

6.0 Summary of the Comparative Analysis of Alternatives

This section of the ROD amendment provides the basis for determining which alternative provides the best balance with respect to the statutory balancing criteria in Section 121 of CERCLA and in Section 300.430 of the NCP. The major objective of the original Feasibility Study was to develop, screen, and evaluate alternatives for the remediation at the Cedartown Site. Three alternatives were re-evaluated using the following nine evaluation criteria:

- Overall protection of human health and the environment.
- Compliance with applicable and/or relevant Federal or State public health or environmental standards.
- Long-term effectiveness and permanence.
- Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume of hazardous substances or contaminants through treatment.
- Short-term effectiveness, i.e., the impacts a remedy might have on the community, workers, or the environment during the course of implementing it.
- Implementability, i.e., the administrative or technical capacity to carry out the alternative.
- Cost-effectiveness considering costs for construction, operation, and maintenance of the alternative over the life of the project, including additional costs should it fail.
- Acceptance by the State.
- Acceptance by the Community.

The NCP categorizes the nine criteria into three groups:

(1)Threshold Criteria - overall protection of human health and the environment and compliance with ARARs (or invoking a waiver) are threshold criteria that must by satisfied in order for an alternative to be eligible for selection;

(2)Primary Balancing Criteria - long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; short-term effectiveness; implementability, and cost are primary balancing factors used to weigh major trade offs among alternative hazardous waste management strategies; and

(3)Modifying Criteria - state and community acceptance are modifying criteria that are formally taken into account after public comment is received on the proposed plan and incorporated in the ROD amendment.

The selected alternative must meet the threshold criteria including compliance with all ARARs or be granted a waiver for compliance with ARARs. Any alternative that does not satisfy both of these requirements is not eligible for selection. The Primary Balancing Criteria are the technical criteria upon which the detailed analysis is primarily based. The final two criteria, known as Modifying Criteria, assess the public's and the state agency's acceptance of the alternative. Based on these final two criteria, EPA may modify the remedial action.

The following analysis is a summary of the evaluation of alternatives considered for remediating groundwater for the Cedartown Site under each of the criteria.

Threshold Criteria

6.1 Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

All alternatives would provide overall protection of human health and the environment. Alternative 2 would be most protective, if groundwater could be effectively pumped and treated. Alternatives 1 and 3 would be equally protective; however, alternative 1 would provide additional sampling data to demonstrate that contamination is not migrating. For alternative 3, groundwater areas which exceed the performance standard would be restricted from use as drinking water by deed restrictions. Groundwater beyond this affected area would meet performance standards and would be safe for human use.

6.2 Compliance with ARARs

Alternative 2 could be implemented to comply with all ARARs described in the original ROD. For the ARARs related to the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Lead and Copper Rule, Alternatives 1 and 3 would comply with drinking water maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) or action levels for all contaminants of concern, except manganese. For manganese, Alternatives 1 and 3 would utilize institutional controls to restrict use of groundwater which exceeded the health-based performance standard for manganese. Alternatives 1 and 3 could be implemented to comply with all other ARARs.

Primary Balancing Criteria

6.3 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence

All alternatives would provide long-term effectiveness and permanence through the landfill cover maintenance and seep controls. Alternatives 1 and 3 would provide additional long-term effectiveness and permanence by utilizing institutional controls to ensure that groundwater with elevated levels of manganese is not used for human consumption. Alternative 2 would provide additional long-term effectiveness and permanence by actively treating contaminated groundwater.

6.4 Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility or Volume Through Treatment

Since existing data has demonstrated that contaminant levels are not migrating further from the Site, treatment to reduce toxicity, mobility or volume is not included in Alternatives 1 and 3. Only alternative 2 would provide treatment to reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of contamination through the pump and treat system.

6.5 Short-Term Effectiveness

Alternative 1 would include continued groundwater monitoring which presents minimal risk to workers, community or the environment. Alternative 2 would involve construction of a pump and treat system. Such construction activities may produce short term impacts from dust and noise. Impacts from these activities could be reduced by normal dust and noise controls. Alternative 3 is highly effective in the short term. This alternative would involve no construction activities, which could present a risk to workers, community, or the environment. The implementation of institutional controls will provide protection of human health from remaining groundwater contamination.

6.6 Implementability

Alternative 1 involves a continuation of groundwater monitoring and is easily implemented with utilization of readily available sampling and analytical services. Alternative 2 involves construction activities and methods which are easily acquired. Alternative 3 is easily implemented, since it involves only periodic maintenance of the cover and implementation of institutional controls.

6.7 Cost

The estimated cost for Alternative 1 is relatively low at $320,275. Alternative 2 has the highest estimated cost at $8,631,000. The cost for Alternative 3 is minimal, since it involves only periodic maintenance of the cover and implementation of institutional controls. The estimated cost is $5,000.

Modifying Criteria

6.8 State Acceptance

The State of Georgia has concurred on this amendment to the selected remedy (Appendix A).

6.9 Community Acceptance

EPA has selected institutional controls and landfill cover maintenance as the remedy for the Site. EPA received only one comment on the proposed plan which supported selection of Alternative 3 - Institutional and Engineering Controls.

7.0 Selected Remedy

Based upon the Administrative Record, consideration of the requirements of CERCLA, the NCP, the detailed analysis of alternatives and public and state comments, EPA has selected an amended remedy for this site. The selected cleanup alternative to reduce to levels protective of human health and the environment risks posed by contamination found at the Cedartown Site is Alternative 3 - Institutional and Engineering Controls. This remedy involves implementation of institutional controls to restrict groundwater use in the areas where performance standards are exceeded. Groundwater monitoring would not be continued, since existing data has demonstrated that contamination is not migrating away from the site. EPA would conduct a five-year review to determine if the remedy remained protective of human health and the environment. The estimated cost of this remedy is $5,000.

This remedy will protect human health and the environment by restricting groundwater use in areas where performance standards are exceeded. ARARs can be easily met. Although this remedy will not reduce toxicity and volume through treatment, mobility appears to be reduced, as indicated by groundwater monitoring results. The selected remedy is easily implemented and is cost effective.

Performance Standards

The selected remedy will achieve the performance standards specified in the original ROD, with the exception of the area beneath and immediately surrounding the landfill. All activities shall comply with ARARs, and state standards.

8.0 Statutory Determination

Under its legal authorities, EPA's primary responsibility at Superfund sites is to undertake remedial actions. that achieve adequate protection of human health and the environment. In addition, Section 121 of CERCLA establishes several other statutory requirements and preferences. These specify that, when complete, the selected remedy must meet appropriate environmental standards established under Federal and State environmental laws unless a statutory waiver is justified. The selected remedy also must be cost-effective and utilize permanent solutions and alternative treatment technologies or resource recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable. Finally, the statute includes a preference for remedies that employ treatment that permanently and significantly reduce the volume, toxicity, or mobility of hazardous wastes as their principal element. The amended remedy meets the statutory requirements and preferences of Section 121 of CERCLA as further explained below.

8.1 Protection of Human Health and the Environment

The selected remedy protects human health and the environment through restricting the use of groundwater beneath and immediately surrounding the landfill and through landfill cover maintenance. The selected remedy provides protection of human health and the environment by eliminating, reducing, and controlling risk through engineering controls and/or institutional controls. Institutional and engineering controls will prevent exposure to contaminants while natural attenuation occurs over time.

8.2 Attainment of the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)

Remedial actions performed under CERCLA, as amended by SARA, must comply with all applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) unless a waiver is justified. All alternatives considered for the site were evaluated on the basis of the degree to which they complied with these requirements. The selected alternative was found to attain ARARs.

ARARs for the Cedartown Site are found in Tables 1, 2, and 3 and are discussed below.

Chemical-Specific ARARs

Groundwater performance standards which are maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) under the Safe Drinking Water Act have been met at the site. The performance standard for manganese was developed using EPA's risk assessment guidelines. The manganese performance standard will be met by restricting use of groundwater which exceeds the manganese performance standard.

The selected remedy will comply with all other relevant and appropriate regulations.

Action-Specific ARARs

Because actions required by the selected remedy are limited to institutional and engineering controls, the only action-specific ARAR for the remedy is the Georgia Water Well Standards Act.

Location-Specific ARARs

The selected remedy will not impact critical habitats for threatened or endangered species. Neither will it impact wild or scenic rivers or any other sensitive habitat.

Other Guidance To Be Considered

Other guidance to be considered (TBCs) include the Georgia Hazardous Site Response Act.

8.3 Cost Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness is determined by comparing the cost of all alternatives being considered with their overall effectiveness to determine whether the costs are proportional to the effectiveness achieved. The selected remedy (Alternative 3) will reduce or eliminate risks to human health at an estimated cost of $5,000. It is expected to achieve an effectiveness comparable to Alternatives 1 and 2 at a substantially lower cost (although over a longer time period than Alternative 2).

8.4 Utilization of Permanent Solutions to the Maximum Extent Practicable

EPA has determined that the selected remedy represents the maximum extent to which permanent solutions can be utilized in a cost-effective manner at the Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site. Of those alternatives which meet the threshhold criteria, EPA has determined that the selected remedy provides the best balance between long-term effectiveness and permanence, short-term effectiveness, and implementability, while also considering the statutory preference for treatment and state and community acceptance.

8.5 Preference for Treatment as a Principal Element

EPA believes that the selected remedy provides that best balance of all of the evaluation criteria. However, the statutory preference for treatment will not be met by this selected remedy for the above stated reasons. Existing data have demonstrated that contaminant levels are not migrating from the Site.

9.0 Documentation of Significant Changes

None identified.

TABLE 1
POTENTIAL CHEMICAL SPECIFIC ARARs

	Description	Citation
CLEAN WATER ACT - 33 U.S.C. 1251-1376		
R&A	Provides for the establishment of water quality criteria based on toxicity to aquatic organisms and human health.	40 CFR Part 131 Ambient Water Quality Criteria Requirements
R&A	Sets standards to control pollutants which pass through or interfere with treatment processes in publicly-owned treatment works or which may contaminate sewage sludge.	40 CFR Part 403 - National Pretreatment Standards
SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT - 40 U.S.C. 300		
A	Establishes primary drinking water regulations pursuant to Section 1412 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by the Safe Drinking Water Act; and related regulations applicable to public water systems.	40 CFR Part 141 National Primary Drinking Water Regulations
A	Establishes National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations pursuant to Section 1412 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 300g-1); and control contaminants in drinking water that primarily affect the aesthetic qualities relating to the public acceptance of drinking water.	40 CFR Part 143 National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations
RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT - 42 U.S.C. 6901-6987		
R&A	Identifies those solid wastes which are subject to regulation as hazardous wastes. Defines the term "solid waste" and "hazardous waste".	40 CFR Part 261 Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste
R&A	Establishes standards for generators of hazardous waste.	40 CFR Part 262 Standards Applicable to Generators of Hazardous Waste

CLEAN AIR ACT - 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642 .		
R&A	Establishes standards for ambient air quality to protect public health and welfare.	40 CFR Part 50 - National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standards
STATE OF GEORGIA REGULATIONS		
R&A	Establishes rules and regulations for Georgia drinking water standards and addresses wellhead protection zones.	Georgia Drinking Water Regulations, Chapter 391-3-5
A	Establishes Georgia surface water quality criteria.	Georgia Water Quality Control Regulations and Standards
R&A	Establishes standards for ambient air quality to protect public health and welfare.	Georgia Air Quality Act, Chapter 391-3-1

A -------APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WERE PROMULGATED UNDER FEDERAL LAW TO SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, POLLUTANT, CONTAMINANT, REMEDIAL ACTION LOCATION OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE.

R & A----RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WHILE THEY ARE NOT "APPLICABLE" TO A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, POLLUTANT, CONTAMINANT, REMEDIAL ACTION, LOCATION, OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE, ADDRESS PROBLEMS OR SITUATIONS SUFFICIENTLY SIMILAR TO THOSE ENCOUNTERED AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE THAT THEIR USE IS WELL SUITED TO THE SITE.

TABLE 2
POTENTIAL ACTION-SPECIFIC ARARs

CLEAN WATER ACT - 33 U.S.C. 1251-1376		
A	Provides for the establishment of water quality criteria based on toxicity to aquatic organisms and human health.	40 CFR Part 131 Ambient Water Quality Criteria Requirements
R&A	Sets standards to control pollutants which pass through or interfere with treatment processes in publicly-owned treatment works or which may contaminate sewage sludge.	40 CFR Part 403 - National Pretreatment Standards
R&A	Requirements limiting injection of fluids into underground sources of drinking water	40 CFR Part 144 - Underground Injection Program
R&A	Specifies sampling, analytical and monitoring requirements for public water systems	40 CFR Part 141 - Nation Primary Drinking Water Standards
R&A	Sets standards to control pollutants which pass through, interfere with, and contaminate treatment processes in public treatment works.	40 CFR Part 403 - National Pretreatment Standards
RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT - 42 U.S.C. 6901-6987		
R&A	Established minimum levels of performance required of any solid waste land disposal site operation including operation and maintenance.	40 CFR 257-258 - Solid Waste Management Regulations
R&A	Characterizations of treatment facility generated sludges	40 CFR Part 261 - Identification and Listing of Hazardous Wastes
R&A	General requirements for identifying and managing hazardous wastes and manifest requirements for hazardous wastes	40 CFR Part 262 - Standards Applicable to Generators of Hazardous Waste
R&A	Establishes standards which apply to transporting hazardous waste within the U.S., if required under 40 CFR Part 262.	40 CFR Part 263 - Standards Applicable to Transporters of Hazardous Waste

R&A	Establishes minimum national standards which define the acceptable management of hazardous wastes for owners and operators of facilities which treat, store, or dispose of hazardous wastes.	40 CFR Part 264 - Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) Facilities
CLEAN AIR ACT - 42 U.S.C. 7401-7624		
R&A	Addresses hazardous air pollutants at their point of emission from specific sources	40 CFR Part 61 - National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
STATE OF GEORGIA REGULATIONS		
R&A	Establishes minimum state standards for the siting, construction, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of wells and boreholes.	Georgia Water Well Standards Act, Chapter 12-5-120 through 138.
R&A	Establishes minimum state standards which define the acceptable management of hazardous wastes for owners and operators of facilities which treat, store or dispose of hazardous waste.	Georgia Hazardous Waste Management Act, Chapter 391-3-11.
R&A	Establishes minimum levels of performance required of any solid waste land disposal site operation.	Georgia Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act, Chapter 391-3-4.
R&A	Establishes pretreatment standards and permit requirements for publicly-owned treatment works, criteria and standards for injection wells, and authorizes DNR to issue discharge permits.	Georgia Water Quality Control Act, Chapter 391-3-6

A -------APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WERE PROMULGATED UNDER FEDERAL LAW TO SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, POLLUTANT, CONTAMINANT, REMEDIAL ACTION LOCATION OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE.

R & A----RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WHILE THEY ARE NOT "APPLICABLE" TO A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, POLLUTANT, CONTAMINANT, REMEDIAL ACTION, LOCATION, OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE, ADDRESS PROBLEMS OR SITUATIONS SUFFICIENTLY SIMILAR TO THOSE ENCOUNTERED AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE THAT THEIR USE IS WELL SUITED TO THE SITE.

TABLE 3
POTENTIAL LOCATION SPECIFIC ARARs

	Description	Citation
R&A	Regulate activities in critical habitats in which endangered or threatened species are found.	Endangered Species Act of 1973 (50 CFR Parts 200 and 402) and Fish and Wildlife Coordination (33 CFR Parts 320-330)
R&A	Regulates activities in areas designated as wild, scenic, or recreational rivers.	Wild and Scenic River Act (40 CFR Part 6.302(e))
STATE OF GEORGIA REGULATIONS		
R&A	Establishes minimum levels of performance required of any solid waste land disposal site operation.	Georgia Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Act, Chapter 391-3-4.
R&A	Regulates activities in critical habitats upon which endangered or threatened species depend.	Endangered Wildlife and Wildflower Preservation Act of 1973, Chapter 391-4-10.

A -------APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WERE PROMULGATED UNDER FEDERAL LAW TO SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, POLLUTANT, CONTAMINANT, REMEDIAL ACTION LOCATION OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE.

R & A----RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS WHICH WHILE THEY ARE NOT "APPLICABLE" TO A HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE, POLLUTANT, CONTAMINANT, REMEDIAL ACTION, LOCATION, OR OTHER CIRCUMSTANCE AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE, ADDRESS PROBLEMS OR SITUATIONS SUFFICIENTLY SIMILAR TO THOSE ENCOUNTERED AT THE CEDARTOWN SITE THAT THEIR USE IS WELL SUITED TO THE STTE.

TABLE 4
TO-BE-CONSIDERED (TBC) DOCUMENTS

	Description	Citation
TBC	Establishes State hazardous substance cleanup activities and requirements	Georgia Hazardous Site Response Act (HSRA), Chapter 391-3-19

TBCs - To-be-considered criteria are documents which are not legally binding, but should be considered in determining the necessary level of cleanup for protection of human health or the environment.

APPENDIX A
STATE CONCURRENCE LETTER

<IMG SRC 98150F>

Dear Mr. Green:

The Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has reviewed the draft Record of Decision (ROD) amendment for the Cedartown Municipal Landfill Site (Cedartown Site) in Cedartown, Georgia. The original ROD, signed in November of 1993, called for monitoring and institutional controls to address potential risks to human health and the environment resulting from possible releases to groundwater of chromium and manganese. The original ROD called for groundwater and surface water monitoring, landfill cover maintenance and seep controls, and land-use restrictions. The original ROD also contained a pump-and-treat contingency in case the groundwater performance standard could not be met.

This ROD amendment is based on new information collected during the remedial action. Groundwater data collected during the previous two and one-half years has shown that no constituents, except manganese, remain above performance standards. Additional data from the site indicate that the source of the manganese is not the result of waste disposal.

The major components of this amendment are:

- institutional controls to restrict groundwater use beneath and immediately surrounding the Cedartown Site,
- maintenance of the landfill cover, and
- removal of the requirement for groundwater monitoring and the pump-and treat contingency.

Because there is the possibility that hazardous constituents may remain on site, a five-year review will be conducted, and it will include another groundwater sampling event. Georgia EPD hereby concurs with the selected remedy.

Sincerely,

<IMG SRC 98150G>

C. Ms. Annie Godfrey, U.S. EPA
Mr. David Johnson, City of Cedartown

File: Cedartown Municipal Landfill (B)